

## Charge to PAC 29

### Jefferson Lab requests that PAC 29:

1) Review both new proposals\* and extensions<sup>†</sup> or updates<sup>‡</sup> to previously-approved proposals, and provide advice on their scientific merit, technical feasibility and resource requirements.

2) Recommend one of four actions on each proposal, extension or update:

- approval,
- conditional approval status pending clarification of special issues,
- deferral with regret,
- deferral, or
- rejection.

(There are two types of conditional approval: conditional pending PAC review of open scientific questions; and conditional pending Jefferson Lab management review of open technical issues. In the later case, the PAC should recommend a beam time allocation.)

3) Provide a scientific rating and recommended beam-time allocation for all proposals recommended for approval.

4) Provide comments on letters-of-intent.

5) Comment on the Hall running schedules.

\* Previously-approved proposals that have not, within 3 years of PAC approval, been scheduled to run to completion are returned to the PAC for a fresh scientific review. For the purposes of these reviews, the “jeopardy” experiments are to be treated consistently with new proposals.

<sup>†</sup> Extension proposals are treated as new proposals, and the merits and status of the original proposal are considered only to the extent that they may bear on the relevance and merit of the extension proposal.

<sup>‡</sup> In reviewing an experiment update, the PAC will treat the original proposal and any request for changes taken together as a single new proposal and treat the combination in a manner analogous to a previously-approved proposal undergoing a jeopardy review.